

ADP-RFP-04-11: 2005 Prevalence Study of Problem Gambling in California Questions and Answers

Methodology and Research Questions

1. Would the Office of Problem Gambling (OPG) consider a departure from the requested study methodology (i.e., general population survey) outlined in ADP-RFP-04-11 and entertain undertaking a study that takes advantage of an advanced design in public health epidemiology? That is, would OPG seriously consider a study that uses a combined social indicator and representative sample survey that ultimately would provide more valuable information and a future-oriented research structure for the OPG?

Answer: If you are able to fully address OPG's goals stated in the RFP, keep within the stated timeframe and budget, and also utilize your recommended approach, you will not be precluded from proposing a combined social indicator and representative sample survey for OPG's consideration. Page 16, Section 2.4B. of the RFP states that you may develop additional research questions that you think are relevant.

2. Regarding, RFP page 8, paragraph 1.7b) What are the precision expectations for the estimates described in paragraph 1.7.B of the RFP.

Answer: OPG's primary goal is to have data collected at the unit level (e.g., age of the individual, primary gambling venue of the individual, etc.) with a subsequent data analysis as outlined in Section 1.7B. Collected data must be configured and stored by the Contractor, for future use by OPG, to allow for the ability to cross-tabulate among various demographic characteristics and groupings, that goes beyond the scope of this RFP.

3. (Regarding, RFP page 8, paragraph 1.7b) What are ADP's expectations related to data collection methods (e.g. mode of survey administration?).

Answer: The RFP does not prescribe nor state any preferred method of data collection.

4. How flexible is the 12 month deadline for Final Prevalence Study? We estimate that a rather large survey effort will be required in order to get a large enough sample of problem gamblers (estimated to represent only 3% of the adult population) that will allow us to make accurate estimates of prevalence and association with other variables. After survey development we would have only about 4 months to conduct the survey if a report on these results is due at one year. This seems like a short timeline for what should be a very large survey effort.

Answer: We recognize this is an ambitious time line. There is no flexibility and would expect the contractor to work creatively and efficiently.

5. Into what languages should the survey be translated? Will the OPG give the contractor a list of languages required for survey translation or will the selection of languages be at the discretion of the contractor?

Answer: In order for individuals whose primary language is other than English to not be excluded from participation in the study, language assistance must be provided in the following languages:

- Spanish
- Russian
- Armenian
- Cantonese, Mandarin
- Korean
- Mon-Khmer, Cambodian
- Miao, Hmong
- Laotian
- Vietnamese

The contractor may consider utilizing professional translation services as a mediating component in the survey process (See Question #8). The prevalence study sample need not be representative of these specific languages. If used, survey instrument(s) are not required to be translated into these identified languages.

Also, for your information, the following links provide current demographic data from the Department of Finance that you may find useful:

http://www.lif.org/publications/policy_brief0503.pdf (Report on California's Latino population.)

http://www.asianlawcaucus.org/pdf/CA_Report_FINAL.pdf (Report on California's Asian population.)

6. On p. 3, section 1.2.C of the RFP, one of the goals of the project is said to be to determine "if a relationship exists between at-risk, problem and pathological gambling and environmental factors". We would appreciate it if you could tell us which environmental factors (e.g., family, community, proximity to gambling venues, etc) the OPG considers to be its most important focus for this study.

Answer: We would be interested in environmental factors such as geographic access of legalized gambling venues.

7. We would like to know whether OPG has an interest in determining the relative prevalence of illegal vs. legal gambling activities and/or the degree of involvement of problem and other gamblers in illegal activities in support of their gambling.

Answer: While OPG is aware that problem gamblers also engage in illegal gambling activities, this particular prevalence study and its associated costs will focus exclusively on legal gambling activities in California.

8. The RFP seeks research to provide estimates of the current prevalence of at-risk, problem and pathological gambling in the adult California population by gender, age, ethnicity, and geographic location as well as additional variables. Bearing in mind the cost considerations associated with the number of desired cross-tabulations, does OPG have any preferences or requirements with respect to:

- ❖ age categorizations within the two major divisions of <65 and 65+
- ❖ specific ethnic subgroups to be identified
- ❖ the level or nature of geographic subdivisions needed
- ❖ the paradigm to be used for measuring “degree of alcohol or drug use”
- ❖ the paradigm to be used for classifying employment status
- ❖ categorizations of household income
- ❖ specific types of disability to be identified
- ❖ the level of specificity of gambling venue
- ❖ the number and specification of primary language groups to be identified

Answer: OPG’s primary goal is to have data collected at the unit level (e.g., age of the individual, primary gambling venue of the individual, etc.) with a subsequent data analysis as outlined in Section 1.7B. Collected data must be configured and stored by the Contractor, for future use by OPG, to allow for the ability to cross-tabulate among various demographic characteristics and groupings, that goes beyond the scope of this RFP.

Specifically regarding:

- ❖ age categorizations within the two major divisions of <65 and 65+: By unit (i.e., increments of one year for 18 years plus).
- ❖ specific ethnic subgroups to be identified:
 - Hispanic Total
 - White, Non-Hispanic
 - Black or African-American
 - American Indian and Alaska Native
 - Asian and Pacific Islander
- ❖ the level or nature of geographic subdivisions needed: The bidder may group smaller populations/counties by geographic regions and break larger populations/counties into smaller regions utilizing the zip code system.

- ❖ the paradigm to be used for measuring “degree of alcohol or drug use”: Use self-report.
- ❖ the paradigm to be used for classifying employment status: Use categories of “employed, unemployed, retired, and disabled”.
- ❖ categorizations of household income: Use best or common practices, consider a census breakdown.
- ❖ specific types of disability to be identified: Self-report of hearing-impaired, visually-impaired, and mobility-impaired.
- ❖ the level of specificity of gambling venue: All legal gambling venues in California with the exception of charity Bingo.
- ❖ the number and specification of primary language groups to be identified: See Question #5 re: surveys and specific languages.

9. Does OGP have any preferences or requirements with regard to the precision of prevalence estimates for the overall population and/or any particular cross-tabulation cells?

Answer: OPG’s primary goal is to have data collected at the unit level (e.g., age of the individual, primary gambling venue of the individual, etc.) with a subsequent data analysis as outlined in Section 1.7B. Collected data must be configured and stored by the Contractor, for future use by OPG, to allow for the ability to cross-tabulate among various demographic characteristics and groupings, that goes beyond the scope of this RFP.

10. The Scope of Work (RFP Page 9) states that the use of prescription drugs for sleep, pain relief, anxiety and depression must be assessed for all groups in the proposed survey including nongamblers and non-problem gamblers as well as at-risk, problem and pathological gamblers. Can OPG clarify the purpose of investigating this issue which has not previously been addressed in problem gambling prevalence surveys? What level of detail is required in relation to use of prescription drugs? Is OPG seeking information about classes of drugs or about specific brand names and dosages?

Answer: OPG is interested in the relationship between the use of prescription drugs (commonly associated with sleep difficulty, pain, anxiety and depression), and the various categories of adults specified. We are basically interested in the class of prescription drugs, and frequency of use based on self-report among the various categories of adults specified.

11. Does OGP have any preferences or requirements with regard to comparisons of the proposed survey with the results of the prevalence survey conducted in California in 1990 or with the results of problem gambling prevalence surveys in other U.S. and/or international jurisdictions?

Answer: A comparison of the proposed survey with the results of the prevalence survey conducted in California in 1990 or with the results of problem gambling prevalence surveys in other U.S. and/or international

jurisdictions is not included in this RFP scope of work, nor have related costs been included in the funding for this prevalence study. OPG will not consider this additional work under the scope of work.

12. Will OPG consider options for additional data collection and reporting efforts during the second year of the proposed study as long as a completed report meeting the initial scope requirements is completed on schedule?

Answer: If OPG recognized an important need for additional data collection and reporting activities to be provided by the contractor during the second year of the prevalence study implementation, and the original scope of work and contract specifications had been completely satisfied, the original scope of work and related contract could be amended/extended to build in additional data collection and reporting activities. This decision would be contingent on the availability of OPG funds and its funding priorities.

Key Technical Personnel

13. Should proposals present the independent peer reviewer as a subcontractor in the budget proposal?

Answer: Yes, the position of the independent peer reviewer would be classified as a subcontractor and costs for the reviewer activities should be reflected in the appropriate budget line item.

14. (Regarding, RFP page 11, paragraph 8) What are the anticipated hours required for the independent party? and (Regarding, RFP page 11, paragraph 8) How many reports and of what length will the independent party be expected to produce?

Answer: The role of the independent party is to provide a peer review and validation of: (a) the contractor's sampling strategies, (b) data collection instruments, (c) data analysis and (d) interpretation. The peer reviewer will provide written and/or oral reports directly to ADP, at these four critical points, in order to advance the study toward data collection activities and finalization of the study report. Based on the bidder's proposed detailed scope of work and critical milestones, it will be the responsibility of the bidder to consult with the proposed independent party to determine the estimated number of hours and associated costs to conduct the required peer review and validation process for the prevalence study.

The purpose of reporting on the peer review and validation process is to highlight and summarize the process findings and make any necessary recommendations pertaining to the contractor's sampling strategies, data collection instruments, data analysis and interpretation. Based on the

bidder's proposed scope of work, associated time line to complete the work, and identified deliverables, the estimated number and length of the reports will be determined by the independent party. Our expectations are that the reports be clearly written, succinct, and well-organized and satisfies the following question: Is the problem gambling prevalence study being appropriately implemented according to well-recognized research industry standards?

15. How will ADP measure:

- a. a "good working knowledge of the recent expansion of gambling venues in California" and
- b. a "good working knowledge of the problem gambling field, prevention, and/or treatment," as noted in Section 2.4 C 2 of the RFP?

Answer: (15a) The bidder should be able to provide an overview of types of gambling venues in California. The bidder is expected to provide a description of the current legal gambling venues in California by venue type, size, capacity (i.e., number of slots, number of card tables, etc.) and geographical location.

Answer: (15b) The bidder should be able to demonstrate that they have a general knowledge and understanding of (a) of how problem gambling impacts the lives of individuals, families, and communities; and (2) what are the critical prevention and treatment issues faced by states and how they are presently addressing them. Also describe if proposed staff have been directly involved in any past problem gambling studies, consultation, publication of papers, or presentations related to the problem gambling field.

16. The instructions specify (RFP, Page 24) that no more than one proposal from an individual, firm, partnership, corporation or association will be considered and that all bids from an agency that submits more than one bid will be rejected. Does this language apply equally to subcontractors, consultants and/or Peer Reviewers who are involved in more than one proposal?

Answer: No this restriction does not apply. Subcontractors, consultants and/or Peer Reviewers are not limited to offering their services to more than one bidder submitting a prevalence study proposal to OPG.

17. Since the Peer Reviewer will be paid by the Contractor, how does OPG plan to address the likely perception of lack of independence of the Peer Reviewer?

Answer: While costs, and subsequent invoicing, for the peer review and validation process/activities fall under the contractor's detailed budget, the independent peer reviewer will report directly to OPG, at four critical points during the implementation of the study.

Technical Proposal

18. (Regarding, RFP page 23, paragraph 5.3) Is there a maximum number of pages for the technical portion of the proposal response?

Answer: There is no maximum number of pages set for the technical portion of the proposal response. We ask that the technical portion be clearly written, succinct, well-organized and completely addresses all elements outlined in the Technical Proposal section.

19. (Regarding, RFP page 23, paragraph 5.3) Is there a font size recommendation for the proposal?

Answer: There is no required font size as long as the document is easy for the RFP selection committee to read. We prefer a font size between 11 and 12.

Project Work Plan

20. (Regarding, RFP page 23, paragraph 5.3) Is there a maximum number of pages for the Project Work Plan?

Answer: There is no maximum number of pages set for the Project Work Plan. We ask that the Work Plan provide sufficient results-oriented detail, be clearly written, succinct, well-organized and completely addresses all necessary steps to result in a final product: the 2005 Prevalence Study of Problem Gambling in California.

Project Budget

21. (Regarding, RFP page 19, paragraph B2) Is there some level of indirect costs that your agency would consider unacceptable, as a percentage of total direct costs?

Answer: See RFP Section 2.5B.1 (Indirect Cost).: An indirect cost category may be included in the budget if the applicant has a current indirect cost rate approved by the cognizant agency on behalf of the Federal Government; is in the process of obtaining such approval; or has other supporting documentation. A copy of the Agreement approving the rate and/or the supporting justification data must accompany the Bid Proposal if an indirect cost category is requested. ADP reserves the right to deny an indirect cost category and request direct costing.

22. Are applicants expected to cost share or provide matching contributions toward the costs of a study? If it not required, would doing so be viewed favorably in the review process?

Answer: No, applicants are not expected to cost share or provide matching contributions toward the costs of this study. An applicant's offer to cost share or provide matching contributions will not be considered in the scoring/selection criteria.

23. Will cost realism be a consideration in scoring Bid Proposals or budgets? If so, how?

Answer: As suggested by the scoring criteria in the RFP, a proposal that does not adequately explain and justify its budget would receive a lower score than one that is adequately explained and justified. This would apply to costs that are "too low" as well as to costs that are "too high." Proposed costs that cannot be reconciled with other aspects of the proposal might also impact other scoring areas, such as "Bidders Understanding and Approach to Problem." If ADP concludes that a budget proposal is false or misleading, the proposal could be rejected as noted in section 6.4 of the RFP. Once a bidder is selected that provides the best value to ADP, ADP will require that bidder to honor all aspects of its proposal. The winning bidder's costs are subject to audit, as noted in Section 1.B.23 of the RFP and the General Terms and Conditions which will be included in the contract. Finally, if a problem with a proposed budget, or any other part(s) of the proposals results in a situation where no bidder offers acceptable value to ADP, ADP could decline to award the contract to any bidder, as noted in Section 5.13 of the RFP.

24. Could you please mail me BID ADP-RFP-04-11, and if there are any previous contracts on this bid could you also mail the rates from that previous contract?

Answer: This will be the first contract to conduct a problem gambling prevalence study, and therefore no rate information is available to provide.

Publications/Reports

25. (Regarding, RFP page 12 & 34, paragraph 22 & 11) In addition to Spanish, please provide a list of the languages that will be required in order to produce publications for a monolingual or sight-impaired person.

Answer: Regarding, RFP page 12 & 34, paragraph 22 & 11, this language is required to be included in our Department's Requests-for-Proposals and related contract language, based on Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements. The contractor would be expected to comply with the ADA requirements. To date, no one has requested from our Department that a contract-output document of this type to be made available in Braille or any other format/language except English. The matter pertaining to languages other than Spanish and number of copies required would be addressed if and when the request is made by an individual interested in obtaining the documents that result from the contract. We cannot provide any specific guidance to build the related costs to meet these types of requests.

26. (Regarding, RFP page 12 & 34, paragraph 22 & 11) In addition to the following publications, what other publications would be required to be produced for a monolingual or sight-impaired person?

- Publications
- Executive Summary
- PowerPoint Public Presentation
- Final Report

Answer: For purposes of providing access to monolingual or sight-impaired individuals, only the following three types of publications must be made available: publications, executive summary, and the final report.

27. (Regarding, RFP page 12 & 34, paragraph 22 & 11) Please provide the quantity of each publication that should be anticipated for each language (assuming no significant sight impairment), for each format accessible by sight-impaired persons who speak English, and for persons who are both monolingual and are sight-impaired.

Answer: Answer: Regarding, RFP page 12 & 34, paragraph 22 & 11, this language is required to be included in our Department's Requests-for-Proposals and related contract language, based on Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements. The contractor would be expected to comply with the ADA requirements. To date, no one has requested from our Department that a contract-output document of this type to be made available in Braille or any other format/language except English. The matter pertaining to languages other than Spanish and number of copies required would be addressed if and when the request is made by an individual interested in

obtaining the documents that result from the contract. We cannot provide any specific guidance to build the related costs to meet these types of requests.

28. Is the contractor allowed to create and distribute its own publication summarizing the results of this research?

Answer: The bidder may create and distribute its own publication, after the state contract requirements have been satisfied and upon direct review and approval of the publication by OPG. See page 12, Section 1.7B.19 of the RFP and Significant Contract Terms, Items 13 (Contract Product Disclaimer/Credit Statements) and 14 (Rights in Data). At the conclusion of the contract, an agreement will be reached between the contractor and OPG regarding any future publications.

Overall Bidding Process

29. Would ADP please provide a list of the names of bidders that submitted questions?

Answer: ADP/OPG will not be providing a list of the names of bidders that submitted questions. But all bidders submitting their individual questions, will receive a response to all inquiries posed by other bidders. The answers will also be posted to the public ADP website and General Services website. The following links are:

<http://www.adp.ca.gov/OPG/OPGfunding.shtml>

http://www.cscr.dgs.ca.gov/cscr/contract_ads/display/contract_ad_search_list.asp

Select: Search by Agency

Scroll down to: "Department of Alcohol and Drug Programs"

Click on "Submit"

Click on: "ADP-RFP-04-11 2005 Prevalence Study of Problem Gambling in California"

30. Regarding the letter of intent - is it mandatory (would applicants that do not submit a letter be disqualified from submitting formal proposals)?

Answer: According to the RFP, pages 22 and 27, all bidders are required to submit a brief Letter of Intent by regular mail, FAX or Email, by May 1, 2005. Letters of Intent do not constitute a commitment to apply. Failure to submit a Letter of Intent by the deadline, will disqualify the bidder from submitting a formal proposal.

31. Will there be any provision for two or more bidders to prepare and submit “Best and Final Offers” (BAFOs) and engage in negotiations with OPG regarding the final scope and cost of the proposed study?

Answer: No, there will be no provision for two or more bidders to prepare and submit “Best and Final Offers” (BAFOs) and engage in negotiations with OPG regarding the final scope and cost of the proposed study.